



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,126	11/29/2001	Judith Aronhime	1662/50308	3388
26646	7590	11/04/2003		
			EXAMINER	
			WRIGHT, SONYA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/997,126	ARONHIME ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sonya Wright	1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 147-188 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 167-184 and 186-188 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 147-149, 151, 153, 154, 156, 158-166 and 185 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 150, 152, 155 and 157 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1103</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-146 have been canceled. Claims 147-188 have been added. Claims 147-188 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the response filed July 28, 2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no other product than atorvastatin hemi-calcium Form VIII can be made by the process claimed in claims 167-184 since the base claim 167 positively recites "conversion to the crystalline atorvastatin hemi-calcium of claim 147 or a solvate thereof. Applicant further argues that since the product claims are allowable and the process of making is not distinct, Applicants' claims to use of the product must be joined with Group II. Applicant argues that claim 188 is also to a method of using a patentable product and must be joined with Group II. Applicant argues that no reasons are given in the Action for restriction Groups XXXI and XXXII. Applicant argues that the novelty of claims 185 and 186 lies in the active ingredient atorvastatin hemi-calcium Form VIII. Accordingly, the combination derives its patentability from the subcombination, consequently, there is not two-way distinctness and claims 185 and 186 also must be considered with group II. Applicant further argues that the Patent Office regularly grants patents on novel crystalline forms of chemical compounds that also contain claims to a process for its preparation, methods of using it, and pharmaceutical compositions and dosage forms containing it, or a combination thereof.

Applicant's arguments have been considered. Claim 185 will be rejoined.

However, claims 167-184 and 186-188 will not be rejoined for the following reasons:

Advisory of Rejoinder

The following is a recitation of M.P.E.P. §821.04, Rejoinder:

Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02© and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Where product and process claims are presented in a single application and that application qualifies under the transitional restriction practice pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b), applicant may either (1) elect the invention to be searched and examined and pay the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(s) and have the additional inventions searched and examined under 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2), or (2) elect the invention to be searched and examined and not pay the additional fee (37 CFR 1.129(b)(3)). Where no additional fee is paid, if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. If applicant chooses to pay the fees to have the additional inventions searched and examined pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2), even if the product is found allowable, applicant would not be entitled to a refund of the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) by arguing that the process claims could have been rejoined. 37 CFR 1.26 states that "[m]oney paid by actual mistake or in excess will be refunded, but a mere change of purpose after the payment of money...will not entitle a party to demand such a return..." The fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) were not paid by actual mistake nor paid in excess, therefore, applicant would not be entitled to a refund.

In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 - 1.106. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.

The following is a recitation from paragraph five, "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. §103(b)" (1184 TMOG 86(March 26, 1996)):

"However, in the case of an elected product claim, rejoinder will be permitted when a product claim is found allowable and the withdrawn process claim **depends from or otherwise includes all the limitations of an allowed product claim**. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined." (emphasis added)

Therefore, in accordance with M.P.E.P. §821.04 and *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims with process claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until, such time, a restriction between product claims and process claims is deemed proper. Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to maintain either dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Because the product claims are not allowable (see the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, below) process claims 167-184 and 187-188 will not be rejoined (M.P.E.P. §821.04 and *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995)).

Furthermore, claims 147-166 and claims 187-188 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the

instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product. Applicants submit that "statin drugs are currently the most therapeutically effective drugs available for reducing low density lipoprotein (LDL) particle concentration in the blood stream of patients at risk for cardiovascular disease" (see the specification, page 1, lines 24-27). Therefore, statin drugs (even those beyond the instant compounds) are useful as claimed in claim 188.

Claim 186 will not be rejoined because it is unclear whether the claim is drawn to a compound or a composition.

It is pointed out that the restriction requirement is made under 35 U.S.C. 121. 35 U.S.C. 121 gives the Commissioner (Director) the authority to limit the examination of an application where two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed to only one invention. The Examiner has indicated that more than one independent and distinct invention is claimed in this application and has restricted (limited) the claimed subject matter accordingly. Thus, the requirement to restrict the claims in this application is predicated on the fact that the claimed subject matter involves more than one independent and distinct invention. Accordingly, the restriction is proper. Moreover, it would constitute a burden to extend the search because separate search considerations would be involved in both the U.S. Patents and in the literature. The examination process following the search could easily result in different and thus burdensome considerations. Accordingly, the requirement to restrict is considered proper and is maintained.

Claims 167-184 and 186-188 are withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as constituting other patentably distinct inventions.

The withdrawn subject matter of claims 167-184 and 186-188 is properly restricted as said subject matter differs in structure and element from the elected subject matter so as to be patentably distinct therefrom, i.e. a reference which anticipated the elected subject matter would not even render obvious the withdrawn subject matter and fields of search are not co-extensive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 150, 152, 155, 157, refer to figures. There is insufficient antecedent basis in the claims for the figures cited in the claims. It is improper for claims to refer to subject matter not contained therein, even if the subject matter is contained in the specification. It is suggested that Applicant delete the references to the figures in each occurrence in the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 147-149, 151, 153, 154, 156, 158-166, and 185 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonya Wright, whose telephone number is (703) 308-

4539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (703) 308-4537. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7922. The Official fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Application/Control Number: 09/997,126
Art Unit: 1626

Page 8

Joseph K. McKane
Joseph K. McKane

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 1600

Sonya Wright

November 3, 2003